1	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332) United States Attorney
2	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)
3	Chief, Criminal Division
4	ANDREW P. CAPUTO (CABN 203655) Assistant United States Attorney
5	450 Golden Gate Ave., Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102
6	Telephone: (415) 436-7004 Fax: (415) 436-6753
7	E-Mail: andrew.caputo@usdoj.gov
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
12	
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 08-0884 VRW
14	Plaintiff, ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING
15) TRIAL v.
16	JOSEPH WILLIS, JR.,
17) Defendant.)
18	
19	
20	The Court held a series of detention hearings in this matter, on March 27, April 22, May
21	6, May 11, and May 14, 2009. The defendant, Joseph Willis, Jr., was present at each hearing and
22	represented by Ann Moorman. Assistant United States Attorney Drew Caputo appeared for the
23	United States.
24	Pretrial Services submitted a report to the Court prior to the first detention hearing, and a
25	representative from Pretrial Services was present at each hearing. The Government requested
26	detention, and Defendant opposed. Testimony, proffers and arguments regarding detention were
27	presented by the parties at the hearings. The Court conducted an evidentiary hearing on May 11,
28	2009.
	DETENTION ORDER CR 08-0884 VRW

DETENTION ORDER

CR 08-0884 VRW

Upon consideration of the facts, proffers, evidence and arguments presented, the Court finds that Defendant enjoys substantial family and community support and appears to have taken on the role of a responsible father. His residence in the Bay Area is well established. Moreover, he has suffered only one felony conviction (for drugs). Defendant therefore does not represent a flight risk.

Furthermore, were the Court to assess the danger Defendant presents to the community based solely on his criminal history and community ties, it would not find he presents such a danger. However, the Court does find by clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of other persons and the community because of post-arrest telephone conversations, transcripts of which were presented to this Court and live testimony of a San Francisco Police Officer was taken. These taped conversations contained threats to the safety of the informant in this case. Accordingly, the Court concludes that Defendant must be detained pending trial in this matter.

The present order supplements the Court's findings at the May 14, 2009, detention hearing and serves as written findings of fact and a statement of reasons as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i)(1).

The Court makes the following findings as basis for its conclusion that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of other persons and the community. Recorded telephone calls made by Defendant after his arrest on January 4, 2009 contain what the Court finds to be threats or instructions to cause physical harm to the undercover FBI source involved in this case. It is clear that Defendant and those to whom he is speaking knows the identity of the informant who was responsible for his arrest and the arrest of others. In two different calls, Defendant references the need or desire to "smother that steak" in an apparent reference to the informant. The telephone calls also contain references to what the Court finds to be firearms ("super-soakers") apparently in his possession prior to the arrest and accessible by his friends. There also exists substantial evidence of gang affiliation on the part of Defendant and possibly other people with whom Defendant was communicating after his arrest. Although Defendant has not been convicted of a violent crime, he has been arrested for strong armed

robbery and was arrested in the company of gang members who possessed automatic weapons. Significantly, Defendant has not proffered an alternative interpretation of the key words heard on the telephone tapes. The Court is thus left with an undisputed proffer that Defendant threatened the safety of the informant. The combination of these threats together with Defendant's apparent motive and means to cause harm to the undercover source causes the Court to conclude that Defendant presents a risk of danger to other persons – specifically to the undercover source and to those close to the undercover source – that cannot be mitigated adequately by conditions of release.

To be sure, this conclusion is not without some doubt. Although Defendant has not proffered an alternative explanation for the terms "smother that steak" and "super-soakers," his counsel contends these statements were made simply out of frustration or as a show of bravado without any real intent or means to cause harm. But given Defendant's gang affiliation, some evidence of violence in the past, and apparent access to serious weapons, the Court concludes the Government has met its burden.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- 1. Defendant be committed to the custody of the Attorney General for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal;
- 2. Defendant be afforded reasonable opportunity for private consultation with his counsel; and
- 3. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the government, the person in charge of the corrections facility in which Defendant is confined shall deliver Defendant to an authorized deputy United States marshal for the purpose of any appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

As mentioned at the hearing, this ruling is without prejudice to a motion for reconsideration. Should Defendant present additional evidence (*e.g.*, subsequent phone calls, etc.) which negates the Court's finding of a real threat, the Court will review the matter again.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 22, 2009

United States Magistrate Judge

DETENTION ORDER CR 08-0884 VRW